

Remarks

Claims 1, 14 and 15 are cancelled and claims 2, 12 and 13 are amended. Claim 16 is added. Claims 2 to 13 and 16 are pending in this application of which only claims 2 and 16 are in independent form.

The drawings were objected to because the reference character "42" on page 6, line 7, and "14" on page 6, line 23, have both been used to designate turns. The turns "14" were intended only to designate those turns which threadably engage the cylindrical section (43, 43') carrying the outer threads (44, 44'). Page 6, line 23, is amended herein to recite that these sets of turns at the respective ends of the coil spring are now referred to as respective portions 14 of turns 42 at the corresponding ends (10, 13) of the coil spring 9.

The drawings were also objected to because reference character "14" had been used to designate also the component coil on page 9, line 16. Page 9, line 16, is amended herein to recite that it is the end of the coil spring 9 which comes into contact engagement against the stop 52 as shown in FIG. 2 thereby deleting the reference numeral 14 at this location.

The drawings had also been objected to because claim 15 had recited that the work apparatus includes a motor-driven chain saw, cutoff machine and a blower. Claim 15 is cancelled thereby obviating this objection to the drawings.

The drawings should now be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) and 37 CFR 1.83(a) and be acceptable.

Claims 2 to 11 were only objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 2 is amended herein to incorporate therein all the features and limitations of claim 1 so that claims 2 to 11 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 12 and 13 are amended to also be dependent from claim 2 so that these claims too should now be allowable.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmermann et al in view of Mansfield. Claim 16 combines claims 1 and 14 in the context of a work apparatus and the following will show that claim 16 patentably distinguishes the invention over this combination of references.

Zimmermann et al discloses a vibration damper in the context of a portable handheld work apparatus and provides no suggestion or even a hint as to the need for a coupling member extending along the longitudinal center axis of the coil spring. Thus, with Zimmermann et al to consider, our person of ordinary skill has no motivation to seek out prior art wherein a coupling element might be disclosed, let alone, prior art in an area far afield from a portable handheld work apparatus incorporating an internal combustion engine.

It is true that Mansfield teaches a coupling member as pointed out in the action. However, our person of ordinary skill could not possibly hit upon the idea of turning to anchors for boats and the like to arrive at the idea of a coupling element. Zimmermann et al provides no suggestion which could send our artisan to look in this direction.

Applicants' claim 16 is directed to a portable handheld work apparatus comprising the anti-vibration element incorporating the

coupling element as part of this work apparatus so that claim 16 should now patentably distinguish the applicants' invention over the combination of Zimmermann et al and Mansfield and be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter Ottesen  
Reg. No. 25,544

**OFFICIAL**

Walter Ottesen  
Patent Attorney  
P.O. Box 4026  
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: October 15, 2003

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**OCT 16 2003**